



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



BS
1238
.H2
J4

Vignard
5-6-30

1904.]

JASTROW—THE HAMITES AND SEMITES.

173

THE HAMITES AND SEMITES IN THE TENTH CHAPTER OF GENESIS.

BY MORRIS JASTROW, JR.

(Read April 4, 1903.)

I.

The 10th chapter of Genesis is generally admitted to be one of the most remarkable but also one of the most puzzling documents of antiquity. Scholars have been engaged ever since the days of the 'Talmud' and of Eusebius in attempts to identify the nations named in the chapter and in endeavors to determine the point of view from which the division of nations has been made and to ascertain the character of the underlying ethnological and ethnographical scheme, if there be one in the chapter. Modern research, aided to a certain extent by ancient tradition, has succeeded in identifying a large number of the nations enumerated,¹ but the attempts to discover any system in the grouping of the nations have failed chiefly because of the erroneous assumption that an ancient document could give evidence either of scientific accuracy or of ethnological *finesse*. An adequate conception of what really constituted a nation lay beyond the mental horizon of the ancient

For a partial bibliography see Dillmann's *Genesis* (Engl. transl. of sixth ed., Edinburgh, 1897), p. 325. For the Talmudical views and identifications see Neubauer, *La Géographie du Talmud* (Paris, 1868), pp. 421-429.

¹ See for recent expositions the commentaries of Gunkel (1901), Holzinger (1899), Strack (1894), and Driver (1903) to the chapter in question; also Schrader, *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament* (London, 1885), Vol. i, pp. 61-103; and Glaser, *Skizze der Geographie und Geschichte Arabiens*, ii (Berlin, 1890), chaps. 26 to 28. The chapter in Alfred Jeremias' *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients* (Leipzig, 1904), pp. 145-170, is to be especially recommended as the latest summary of accepted identifications and because of its valuable supplementary statements, and suggestions toward the solution of the many problems in the 10th chapter of Genesis. A serious defect, however, of Jeremias' treatment of the chapter is his failure to take sufficiently into account its composite character, consisting, as it does, of two distinct documents together with many glosses and insertions. Thus, what he says about the supposed "Arabian" origin of Nimrod (p. 158) falls to the ground if verses 8-12 are recognized as an addition that stands in no connection with verse 7; nor does Jeremias' general view of the *Völkertafel* as a *unit* (p. 145) commend itself in the light of the critical analysis of the chapter.

world, certainly of the ancient Orient. Apart from a certain instinct—to speak indefinitely—which correctly led a people to predicate its own closer or remoter relationship to others, reliance was placed on more or less uncertain traditions, and the value of such tradition was still further diminished by the subjective factors—a people's likes and dislikes, its experiences and ambitions—that entered as elements into its formation; and when we pass beyond the immediate political environment of an ancient people, we must be prepared for a nebulousness of views that is almost inconceivable to a modern mind and for inconsistencies that are as bewildering as they are numerous. In view of this, it is evident that the critical analysis of the chapter to which modern scholarship has devoted itself with marked success is insufficient for a solution of the problems involved unless it also takes into account the uncritical attitude of the ancient world toward ethnological and geographical data.

The critical analysis of the 10th chapter of Genesis has reached a stage that may, with reasonable certainty, be regarded as definite and as having attained its utmost limits.¹ Of the two documents combined to form the present *Völkertafel*—to use the convenient German term—the one that forms part of the Priestly Code, distinguished by critics as P, forms the chief element, as is the case throughout the first eleven chapters of Genesis,² while the other, designated as J, has only been drawn upon to the extent of furnishing supplementary data, though at times those supplementary data exceed in length the account in P, and, occasionally, J furnishes material, like the story of Cain and Abel, not found in P at all. In the case of the 10th chapter, while J is actually longer than P, yet the latter document represents a far closer approach to a systematic arrangement, whereas J, marked by many glosses, is extracted in so arbitrary a fashion in order to supplement P that it is difficult to obtain an accurate view of the system followed by the "J" document in its original form.

When the two documents are placed side by side, the differences between them will become clear.

¹ Wellhausen, *Composition des Hexateuchs* (3d ed., 1899, pp. 4-7).

² Budde's *Urgeschichte*, pp. 499 *sq.*, pp. 464-465, and also pp. 521-531, where the Jahwistic source in the first eleven chapters of Genesis is put together.

P.

10, (1a) These are the generations of the sons of Noah; Shem, Ham and Japheth. (2) The sons of Japheth were Gomer, Gog,¹ Madai, Javan, Tubal, Meshech and Tiras. (3) The sons of Gomer were Ashkenaz, Rip-hath and Togarmah. (4) The sons of Javan were Elishah, Tarshish, Kittim and Rodanim.² (5) Of these the islands of the nations branched off. [These are the sons of Japheth] according to their lands, each according to his language, according to their clans among their nations. (6) The sons of Ham were Cush, Mizraim, Put and Canaan. (7) The sons of Cush were Seba, Havilah, Sabtah, Raamah and Sabtechah. The sons of Raamah were Sheba and Dedan. (20) These are the sons of Ham according to their clans, their language, according to their lands among their nations. (22) The sons of Shem were Elam, Asshur, Arpachshad, Lud and Aram. (23) The sons of Aram were Uz, Hul, Gether and Mash. (31) These are the sons of Shem according to their clans, their language, according to their lands, according to their nations. (32) These are the clans of the sons of Noah according to their generations, among their nations and from them the nations were divided in the earth after the flood.

¹ Hebrew text has *magog*, which, however, appears to be an error for *gog*.

² So read according to I Chr. I, 6 instead of *Dodanim*.

J.

9, (18) The sons of Noah that went forth of the ark were Shem, Ham and Japheth (gloss: *ana Ham is the father of Canaan*). (19) These three were the sons of Noah; and of them was the whole earth overspread. . . . (10, 18) to them sons were born after the flood. (8) Cush begat Nimrod. [He was the first mighty one in the earth. (9) He was a mighty hunter before Yahweh: wherefore the saying: A mighty hunter like Nimrod before Jahweh. (10) The beginning of his kingdom was Babel, Erech, Accad and Calneh in the land of Shinar. (11) Out of that land he went forth to Assyria and founded Nineveh, Rehoboth-Ir, Calah and (12) Resen (between Nineveh and Calah) (gloss: *that is the great city*)]. . . . (13) Mizraim begat Ludim, Anamim, Lehabim, Naphtuhim, (14) Pathrusim, Casluhim and Capthorim (gloss: *whence went forth the Philistines*¹). [(15) Canaan begat Sidon his first born and Heth (16) (gloss: *the Jebusite, Amorite, Girgasite, (17) Hivite, Arkite, Sinite, (18) Arvadite, Zemarite and Hamathite*)]. Afterwards the clans of the Canaanite spread, (19) so that the boundary of the Canaanite extended from Sidon to Gerar [gloss: to Gaza] to Sodom and Gomorrah [gloss: to Admah and Zeboim] to Lasha. . . . (21) And to Shem also (sons) were born, the father of all the sons of Eber, the elder brother of Japheth. . . . (24) Arpachshad begat Shelah and Shelah begat Eber. (25) To Eber two sons were born, the name of the one was Peleg (gloss: *for in his days the earth was divided*²) and the name of his brother was Joktan. (26) Joktan begat Almodad, Sheleph, Hazarmaveth, Jerah, (27)¹ Hadoram, Uzal, Diklah, (28) Obal, Abimael, Sheba, (29) Ophir, Havilah and Jobab. All these were the sons of Joktan. (30) Their settlement was from Mesha to Sephar, the mountain of the east.

¹ Cf. Amos 9, 7; Jer. 47, 4; Deut. 2, 23.

² *niphlegâ*.

II.

Beginning with 10, 1^a, as a heading,

“ These are the generations of the sons of
Noah ; Shem, Ham and Japheth,”

P furnishes (verses 2-5) the list of nations sprung from Japheth and then takes up (vv. 6-7) the second son Ham, the close of which enumeration is to be sought in v. 20. Thirdly, Shem, the oldest son, is taken up (vv. 22-23), the continuation appearing in v. 31, while v. 32 represents the conclusion of the version as follows :

“ These are the clans of the sons of Noah, according to their generations, according to their tribes and from them the nations were divided in the earth after the flood.”

It will be observed that in this compact survey, resting on the theory of the descent of all the nations of the earth from a single ancestor, Noah, through three groups represented by Noah's three sons, there are decided inequalities in treatment. Of the sons of Japheth, only two, Gomer and Javan, are carried down into further subdivisions. In the genealogy of Ham, only one, Cush, is singled out for further subdivision, but this one is carried down through its branch, Raamah, into a further subdivision, while of the sons of Shem, again, only one, Aram, is further subdivided. Now it is noticeable that none of these nations particularly singled out are such as have had any close or direct contact with the Hebrews. The identification of Gomer with the Gimirrai who appear in the inscriptions of Assyrian kings being quite certain,¹ the subdivisions of Gomer, viz., Ashkenaz,² Riphath and Togarmah, must likewise represent peoples whose settlements are to be sought in the north-eastern or eastern section of Asia Minor. They belong to the “ extreme north,”³ have nothing to do with Hebrew history and could only have been of interest to Hebrews because of the general terror inspired throughout the ancient Orient by the threatening

¹ Cf. Schrader, *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, i, p. 62, and Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, i, pp. 516 and 543-548.

² Distorted from Ashkuza, according to Winckler (*Keilschriften und das Alte Testament*, i, p. 101), who regards them as the Scythians.

³ Cf. Ezekiel 38, 6. Ashkunaz is only referred to once again in the Old Testament, viz., Jer. 51, 27; Riphath not at all and Togarmah twice in Ezekiel 27, 14; 38, 6. The parallel *Völkertafel* (I chr. i, 5-25) dependent on Genesis 10 is, of course, excluded from consideration.

advance movement of northern hordes during the seventh century B.C. The case is somewhat different with Javan, which is to be identified with Ionia.¹ While none of the subdivisions of Javan enter into direct relations with the Hebrews, with the possible exception of Tarshish,² until the time of the inpouring of the Greeks into Semitic settlements after the conquest of the Greeks, Cyprus, represented by Kittim, as well as Rhodes, represented by Rodanim,³ must have been at all events familiar names to the Hebrews in pre-exilic days. A certain amount of interest due to commercial relations may also have been attached to the settlements of the Greek archipelago, comprised under the designation, "Islands of the Nations." For all that, the sons of Javan have little to do with Hebrew history proper until a comparatively late period. Among the sons of Ham—Cush, Put, Mizraim and Canaan—we might have expected the two last-named to have been taken up in detail and carried down into further subdivisions. If instead of this, it is Cush that is carried down into two subdivisions, the conclusion appears justified that in this case, likewise, the point of view is not that of one primarily interested in Hebrew history; and it is equally remarkable that of the sons of Aram, viz., Uz, Hul, Gether and Mash, the last three are never mentioned again in the Old Testament, while Uz appears only as the home of Job and in a passage in Lamentations (4, 21) where it is used in parallelism with Edom.⁴ To be sure, we have the genealogy of Shem in the line Peleg-Eber once more introduced in P, namely, Genesis 11, 10–26, and this time carried down to the immediate ancestor of the Hebrews, Abram. But the very fact that this is not done in the 10th chapter is a further proof for the proposition that

¹ The term is, however, extended to include Greeks in general (see Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, i, p. 492). In a paper read before the American Oriental Society at Washington, April 8, 1904 (to be published in Vol. 25 of the *Journal of the Amer. Or. Soc.*), Prof. C. C. Torrey showed that in the book of Daniel (8, 21; 10, 20; 11, 2) and in the first book of Maccabees, as well as in the Talmudic notices, Javan is even used to designate the Greek kingdom of Syria, replacing the earlier usage as, e.g., in the 10th chapter of Genesis, for which we would thus have as a *terminus ad quem* the fourth century B.C.

² See Haupt's discussion of the historical and archaeological problems connected with Tarshish in his paper published in abstract in the *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Congress of Orientalists* (1902), Section v.

³ Jer. 25, 20, is to be excluded, because of the doubtful state of the text.

the enumeration of the thirty-four nations or groups included in P's *Völkertafel* is not done from the point of view of one interested in Hebrew history. The situation is just reversed when we come to the other source, known as J, which has been combined by later compilers with P. Though, unfortunately, only a fragment of the original *Völkertafel* of the Jahwist has been preserved, yet what data there are, including a number of later glosses and other additions, are all of a kind that betray a manifest interest in Hebrew history and not in general ethnology.

III.

For the introduction to the second version, we must go back to the close of the 9th chapter where we read (verses 18-19):

"The sons of Noah that went forth of the ark were Shem, Ham and Japheth.¹ These three were the sons of Noah and of them was the whole earth overspread."

The continuation of the genealogical tradition appears chap. 10, 1^b:

. . . . "to them sons were born after the flood."

After which a break occurs and when we again encounter this Jahwistic version (10, 8) we are in the midst of the genealogy of the Hamites, which extends from verses 8 to 19. First Cush, who begets Nimrod, is taken up, then Egypt and finally Canaan with its offshoots. A second break follows and when the Jahwistic source is again resumed, verses 21 and 24-30, the genealogy of Eber the son of Shem is set forth. Fragmentary as the version thus is—the genealogy of Japheth, *e.g.*, being entirely wanting—a further analysis points to at least two strata of tradition which, apparently distinct from the Jahwistic *Völkertafel*, have been combined with it, together with a number of supplementary or explanatory glosses. The little section 8^b 2 to 12, enlarging upon Nimrod and the origin and extension of Babylonia and Assyria, is couched in an entirely different style from 9, 18-19 and from 10, 13-14, and even in this section verse 9^a, which aims to furnish an explanation for a

¹ There is added here a gloss, "*and Ham is the father of Canaan*," to prepare us for the tale of Ham's disgrace and for the confusion between Ham and Canaan in the curse pronounced by Noah upon his youngest son (vv. 25-27).

² The words "*and Cush begat Nimrod* (8^a) may belong to the original Jahwistic *Völkertafel*.

popular proverb, is a gloss added to the section itself, and interrupts the context. Again 16-18^a represent either a series of glosses or belong to a different source, while the style of verses 21 and 25-30 is so different again from chap. 9, 18-19, etc., that we are forced to assume here likewise a different stratum. Gunkel¹ distinguishes these two strata as Jj and Je, on the supposition that the Jahwistic documents in the book of Genesis represent the combination of the original Jahwist with additions from the Elohist. Whether we accept this or not, there can be no doubt that within the Jahwistic version several distinct and originally independent sections are to be distinguished. In accordance with this view, we would have of the original Jahwistic *Völkertafel* only a brief notice about Cush, a fuller one of Mizraim, while in the case of Canaan there is left only the indications of the geographical boundaries of Canaanitish settlements. Still all these three groups are of profound interest to a Hebrew historian, Cush because of Nimrod the representative of the Babylonians and Assyrians, while Egyptians and Canaanites enter of course into Hebrew history at frequent points and at important crises.

Taking up the additions to the remains of the original Jahwistic list of nations, it will be found that they fall in the same category of data that have a special interest for the Hebrew historian. The notice about Nimrod specifies the important centres of the Euphrates Valley, Babylon, Erech, Accad (= Agade) and Calneh.² In agreement with the testimony of modern research, the foundation of Assyria is traced back to Babylonia and the extent of Nineveh, "the great city," with its suburbs is set forth.

The introduction of Heth as a son of Canaan (15b) may represent already a supplement to the original Jahwistic document, added because of the interest that the Hittites have for Hebrew history,³ and to this notice a complete list has been added of the groups of the Canaanitish nations which the Hebrews found upon entering the country and with whom they are thus brought into direct contact.⁴ Leaving aside variants or further specifications

¹ *Genesis*, p. 77.

² According to the Babylonian Talmud (Yoma 10^a), Nippur.

³ For a summary of the relations between Hebrew and Hittites, see the writer's article "Hittites" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, Vol. II.

⁴ It is to be noted, however, that verses 17-18 furnish names of groups outside of the Hebrew settlements proper in Canaan.

of the geographical boundaries of Canaanitish settlements, we have lastly the genealogy of Shem, introduced, however, as the opening words show (v. 21),

“To Shem also (sons) were born, the
father of all the sons of Eber,”

for the sake of Eber to whom, through the Eber-Peleg line, the Hebrews are directly traced back. Since, however, this genealogical chain is furnished by P in the following chapter (11, 16–26) the final redactor contented himself in the 10th chapter with supplying from the J source the genealogical line of the other son of Eber, namely, Joktan. This list of Joktanides (verses 26–30) is most valuable for several reasons. In the first place it furnishes the proof for the thesis that the redactor who combined J and P uses the former source as a supplement to P and secondly it shows conclusively that J¹ contained much fuller indications than the other extracts from it used by P might lead us to believe. Indeed the thirteen subdivisions of Joktan represent a much fuller genealogical chain than any to be found in P which records only seven subdivisions for Japheth and five for Cush.² The special reason why the redactor introduces this long line of Joktanites appears to be because it embodies a varying addition from P which places Havilah among the sons of Cush and Sheba under Raamah the son of Cush (verse 7), whereas the other source includes Havilah and Sheba among the Joktanites (verses 28–29) and thus makes them descendants of Shem. It is hardly reasonable to suppose that so palpable an inconsistency should have escaped the notice of the redactor and it is certainly more plausible to assume that just *because* of this contradiction between the two sources, both were introduced side by side, in accordance with the general character of historical composition in the ancient Orient which is so largely compilation. The Arabic historians of later days who are the

¹ Or JE (*i.e.*, Jahwist and Elohist) if we follow Gunkel's view as set forth above (p. 179).

² If it be assumed that the enumeration of the Eber-Peleg line in the 11th chapter has been transferred from its proper place in P's *Völkertafel*, it would follow that P's list may also have originally been somewhat fuller than at present appears, but this would not alter the main proposition that P represents the *basis* in the 10th chapter of Genesis, supplemented by J and possibly other sources.

natural successors of the Hebrew compilers and redactors would have proceeded in the same way, only they would probably have introduced the second source by the word *kila*, "others say," and would have summed up the situation by the usual exclamation, "Allah knows best"—which source is correct.

How complete the Jahwistic *Völkertafel* originally was is, of course, a question to which no definite answer can be given. If the reference to Nimrod as the son of Cush (8^a) belonged to the oldest source in J, it would suffice as evidence that at least two branches—Semites and Hamites—were included and this conclusion is confirmed by the inclusion of Canaan and Mizraim (13-15) but there is no reference in any of the remaining parts of J to Japheth. This may of course have been due to the omission of the Japheth genealogy by the redactor who combined J with P, and if this be the case the further conclusion would be justified that J contained nothing of moment with regard to Japheth that was not already mentioned in P. But besides the possibility that J did not contain any genealogy of the descendants of Japheth—though in view of the heading Gen. 9, 18 this is unlikely—there remains as an alternative that Japheth may have been included by J under Shem. There are some strong reasons for concluding that such was the case in at least one of the sources worked up by the "J" school of narrators. Attention has long since been directed¹ to the circumstance that in the story of Noah's curse pronounced on his youngest son (9, 25-27) which is attributed by Gunkel² to J^o, the name of the son who is disgraced is Canaan, doomed to be "a servant of servants unto his brethren," and this is emphasized by a triple repetition of the curse (verses 25, 26, 27), each time with the name of Canaan. It follows accordingly that the three sons according to what is evidently an earlier tradition are Shem,³ Japheth and Canaan. In the poetical fragment of the curse, Shem and Japheth are represented to be in close contact with each other. Accepting with Gunkel,⁴ Grätz's simple and striking emendation of verse 26^b,

¹ See, e.g., Budde, *Urgeschichte*, p. 300 sq., and the discussion of Gunkel (*Com. to Genesis*, pp. 71-76) and Holzinger (*Genesis*, pp. 91-93).

² *Genesis*, p. 71.

³ Or perhaps Eber. See below, pp. 201 and 204.

⁴ *L. c.*, p. 78. The change proposed by Grätz merely involves an alteration in the vowels of one word *barákh* ("blessed") for which Grätz suggests *barákh*

"Bless, O Jahweh, the tents of Shem,"

we find in the next verse the hope expressed that Japheth "may dwell in the tents of Shem." Whatever else may be meant by this phrase, it certainly points to a close association of Japheth with Shem. The phrase is intelligible only on the supposition that Shem and Japheth represent two subdivisions of some larger unit in alliance against a common enemy, Canaan; the three—Shem, Japheth and Canaan—so far from representing the nations of the known world, would thus turn out to be originally designations for tribes or clans dividing between them a comparatively restricted strip of territory. Canaan is of course a perfectly definite geographical and ethnic term, and if he is to be the servant of Shem and Japheth, it can only be because he has been or is to be reduced to servitude and subjection in his own land, and if Shem and Japheth are the subjectors they too must belong to the district in which Canaan lies. Shem in the combination stands for the Hebrews as conquerors of Canaan and whatever may have been meant by Japheth—presumably some allies of the Hebrews—the Japheth introduced into the poetical fragment of Noah's curse is totally different from the Japheth who appears in the 10th chapter in P as the ancestor of the "distant" nations or groups.

The later stratum of J no longer knows the subdivisions Shem, Japheth and Canaan. Ham has taken the place of the latter and in order to reconcile the contradiction between the older poem and the later story of Ham's conduct towards his father, the gloss is added in verse 18 "and Ham is the father of Canaan" and again in verse 22 the words "father of Canaan" after Ham's name.¹ The story and the poem do not appear to have originally stood in any connection with each other, the latter being here introduced merely as an appropriate climax, just as elsewhere in the Old Testament we find snatches of old poems attached to later narratives

"bless" (imperative) and the change of *elôhê Shem* "God of Shem" to '*Ohelê Shem* "tents of Shem." Budde (*Urgeschichte*, p. 73) proposes to read *b'rakkh* and to omit *elôhê* so that the section would read

"Blessed of Jahweh is Shem."

The objection to this view (though preferred by Holzinger, *l. c.*, p. 90) is the omission of a word whose presence must be accounted for.

¹ This view seems to me more satisfactory than to regard "Ham the father" as the gloss which, to be sure, would make Canaan the chief actor as in the original form of the story was the case.

having no connection originally with the tale itself.¹ Whether the introduction of Ham led to the implied change and to the enlargement of the conceptions connected with Japheth is, again, a question on which it is useless to speculate, and we must content ourselves with the recognition of the wide gulf existing between Shem, Japheth and Canaan on the one hand as they appear in the old poem and Shem, Ham and Japheth as found in the later strata of J and in P. The poem is a fragment of an old composition reflecting tribal dissensions—probably in Palestine—whereas the later figures of Shem, Ham and Japheth belong to the period of an enlarged historical perspective and of more advanced political organization, when, through contact with the nations around, interest was aroused in the larger aspects of humanity as a motley group of peoples and when speculation arose as to the origin of the great variety of nations into which mankind appeared to be divided. This speculation woven in with more or less uncertain traditions and legendary lore finds its first definite expression in a survey of the nations of special interest to the Hebrews and its final outcome in such an elaborately constructed list as is furnished by the present *Völkertafel*.

IV.

Coming back, now, to this contrast presented by the remains of an older *Völkertafel* as embodied in J and the later one in P, we are permitted to conclude from the fact that the final redactor of J and P supplemented P's list by data which bear primarily on those nations with whom the Hebrews came into more or less close contact in the course of their history, and since J (with later editions) constituted the source of the compiler for such data, J's *Völkertafel* would thus represent the natural intermediate stage between an indifference on the one hand to the determination of the relationships existing between the nations of the known world—the feature of the period in which Shem, Japheth and Canaan living in close proximity to one another marked the extent of ethnological interest—and the endeavor, on the other hand, to view this relationship

¹ *E.g.*, the so-called "Song of the Well" (Numbers 21, 18) which certainly does not fit in with the narrative in which it has been inserted, and the "Song of Heshbon" (*ib.* vv. 28–30) which is a song celebrating the triumph of some people—hardly the Hebrews—over Moab and which is introduced in connection with a tale of Israel's victory over Sidon. See Gray's *Commentary to Numbers*, pp. 301, 302.

from the broadest standpoint possible to an ancient writer or to a school of ancient writers with imperfect ethnological conceptions and still swayed to a certain extent by various subjective factors.

If, therefore, Japheth formed part of J's *Völkertafel*, we may feel reasonably certain that it did not concern itself with such nations as Gomer, Gog, Ashkenaz, Riphath and Togarmah, to mention only some groups with whom Hebrew history has nothing to do, but at the most with such groups as Tarshish, Cyprus and Tubal and Meshech, with whom at a certain period the Hebrews had at least commercial relations. Leaving this question aside as impossible of more definite determination, the remarkably inclusive though compact character of P's list, drawn up from a point of view which betrays no special interest in Hebrew history, suggests a foreign source for the list itself, or at all events points to foreign influences at work in its composition.

The Priestly Code, being an exilic production, of which at least the substantial elements were drawn up in Babylonia, it would be natural to seek in it influences due to the Babylonian environment. The earlier political relations of their own people with Egypt and Assyria would be sufficient, with the rise of the historical sense, to arouse in the minds of Hebrew writers an interest in nations lying outside of their own immediate circle, but this interest would be materially strengthened under such conditions as confronted the Hebrew exiles settled in the Euphrates Valley. With the national catastrophe putting an end for the time being to their own political history, the Hebrews were in a peculiarly favorable position for realizing what the world meant to a world-power such as Babylonia, which had undertaken to still further develop the legacy of conquest and subjugation bequeathed to her by her rival Assyria, had become in the sixth century. They found themselves in a country which stood for the ideal of world conquest, and which had taken decisive steps for many centuries toward the realization of this ideal. The Assyrians and the Babylonians had come into direct contact with distant nations to the north, south, east and west, and, although their relationship to those nations had generally been hostile, they had, yet, by the encouragement of international commerce brought about a closer affiliation between the peoples of the ancient world, than is ordinarily recognized. It would have been strange indeed if, under such surroundings, the Hebrews had not been led to modify and enlarge their views of the complicated

constitution of mankind. The inscriptions of the Assyrian kings abound in geographical details,¹ and the interest of both Babylonians and Assyrians is still further attested by the numerous geographical lists² that have been found in Ashurbanapal's Library and elsewhere. While it is true that these lists, as a rule, were prepared for practical purposes, in connection with the campaigns or as tribute lists or as exercises to serve in the training of scribes, yet a theoretical interest must also in the course of time have been awakened and some of the lists clearly betray such interest. What applies to Assyria is true also of Babylonia, with perhaps this difference: that in a land like the latter in which culture had reached a higher level than in the north, the theoretical or, as we might also put it, the scientific interest must, if anything, have been much stronger. That the intellectual class among the Hebrew writers was acquainted with Babylonian literature admits scarcely of doubt,³ and whether the compilers of the Priestly Code actually had some cuneiform models before them to serve as the bases for such a list as is found in P, it is certainly permissible and indeed a most reasonable supposition to attribute to Babylonian-Assyrian influence the striking feature of P's list that it deals so largely with groups of peoples that are of interest to Babylonian-Assyrian history and of scarcely any at all to Hebrew history. So of the sons of Japheth, Gomer, Madai, Tubal and Meshech occur more or less frequently in Assyrian inscriptions,⁴ and to these we may add Ashkenaz,⁵ and perhaps Togarmah.⁶ Nor can it be entirely accidental that so many of the groups included under Japheth should be encountered again in the exilic prophet Ezekiel living in Babylonia. He refers to Gomer, Gog, Javan, Tubal,

¹ A glance at the Indices to such works as Schrader's *Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung*, Delitzsch's *Wo Lag das Paradies*, and Winckler-Zimmermann's *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* will suffice to show how large the geographical horizon represented by the cuneiform annals is.

² *E.g.*, Rawlinson, ii, 50-53.

³ See, *e.g.*, D. H. Müller's *Ezechiel Studien*, pp. 56-62, who gives some interesting illustrations that seem to point conclusively to Ezekiel's acquaintance with Babylonian literature. See also Winckler's paper, "Der Gebrauch der Keilschrift bei den Juden" (*Altorientalische Forschungen*, iii, 1, pp. 165-174).

⁴ See the Indexes in the works above referred to.

⁵ See above, p. 176, note 2, and also Baer's *Libri Danielis, Esrae et Nehemiae* (Leipzig, 1882), p. ix.

⁶ See Delitzsch's *Wo Lag das Paradies*, p. 246, and Jeremias' *A. T. im Lichte des Alten Orients*, p. 152.

Meshech and Togarmah,¹ and in general this prophet is distinguished by the very wide range of his geographical knowledge. We are, therefore, justified in concluding that Babylonian influence and contact with the intellectual atmosphere of Babylonia are responsible for the display of geographical interest and learning in P's *Völkertafel* and in Ezekiel. On the other hand, for the knowledge of Ionia (Javan) it was not necessary to turn to Babylonia or Assyria, for as already suggested,² commercial relations between Palestine and the islands and districts lying to the west up to distant Tarshish would account for the knowledge of the chief settlements in the Greek archipelago and regions beyond. This knowledge may well have existed among the Hebrews in pre-exilic days, and the view here maintained by no means implies that all the geographical learning displayed in P comes from contact with Babylonia, but merely that, apart from certain direct influences, the enlargement of the ethnological horizon of Hebrew writers and the impulse to draw up such a *Völkertafel* as is found in P can best be accounted for by the new factor that entered into the intellectual life of the Hebrews through their settling in the Euphrates Valley. Be this as it may, the political contact of the Hebrews with those groups enumerated as sons of Javan did not begin until the period of Greek conquests in the Orient, and, unless we choose to bring the compilation of P's *Völkertafel* down beyond the age of Alexander the Great, which on other grounds is improbable, we are forced to conclude that all the nations enumerated under Japheth are to be placed in the category of peoples with whom the Hebrews up to the time of the composition of the Priestly Code had practically nothing to do. The division of Japheth into two branches, (a) Gomer and offshoots and (b) Javan and offshoots, merely represent from the point of view here maintained the distant nations dwelling to the northeast and north on the one hand, and the groups to the west and northwest on the other, more particularly the inhabitants of the Grecian islands, and those settled along the coast of Asia Minor.

V.

Coming to the Hamitic genealogy, the wavering of traditions

¹See, e.g., chapter 38 of Ezekiel.

²See above, p. 177.

in the case of the sons of Cush makes it difficult to reach any definite conclusion as to the point of view which guided the compiler of P's *Völkertafel*. Besides the contradictions already pointed out in the case of Havilah and Sheba,¹ it is to be noted that Dedan, who in P appears in the genealogy of Cush, is, according to Genesis 25, 3, included with Sheba in the genealogy of Abraham. That in the mind of P, the sons of Cush represent certain nations of southern and central Arabia, with perhaps an inclusion of some groups lying along the eastern coast, is about all that can be said with any degree of definiteness.² That Put in P's list represents primarily the western coast of Africa, from upper Egypt and southwards to Somali (though also applied to the corresponding Arabian coast land), has now been definitely shown.³ We would thus obtain a point of union for Cush and Put in the circumstance that they represent remote people in the mind of P, lying to the extreme south. This might be extended to Mizraim, but certainly Canaan, which has always been the stumbling block in attempts at recognizing any system in the grouping of Hamites, cannot be placed among the nations of the south without our having recourse to the most

¹ See above, p. 180.

² See Jeremias, *A. T. im Lichte d. Alten Orients*, p. 155, and Glaser, *Skizze der Geschichte und Geographie Arabiens*, ii, pp. 387-404. It is unnecessary to pass over to the African coast for the identification of any of the seven groups, though it is certain that P as well as J, in accord with the general usage of the Old Testament, regards Cush also as a designation of Nubia. The term seems to be somewhat indefinitely used for the extreme south (or what appeared to be such to Hebrew writers) without a sharp differentiation between southern Arabia and the corresponding district on the African coast. On Cush as a designation of a part of Arabia in the Old Testament, and in the Cuneiform Inscriptions, see Winckler, *Keilinschriften und das alte Testament*, p. 144-145, summarizing views expressed in his essay, "Musri-Meluhha-Ma'in," i and ii (*Mittheilungen d. Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, Berlin, 1898, pp. 47 sq.), and the same author's *Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen*, p. 165. This double nomenclature of Cush may well be supposed to rest on traditions of an ultimate close relationship between the settlements in Africa and those of southern (and extending into central) Arabia; and if there is any value to be attached to the precise form given to the tradition in the Old Testament, the conclusion might be drawn that the "Arabic" settlements represent the offshoot, i.e., "sons" of the African Cush—a view that on the whole seems more plausible than the contrary hypothesis.

³ See W. M. Müller's *Asien und Europa*, chap. vii. That it designated primarily Arabia is the view of Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, i, p. 86, while Glaser, *Skizze*, etc., ii, pp. 405, 406, proposes southern Arabia and the east coast of Africa.

risky and hazardous conjectures.¹ It is to be noted that Canaan occupies the fourth and last place among the sons of Ham, which of itself raises the suspicion that its addition is due to an after thought, and that, moreover, P does not follow up the genealogy of either Mizraim or Canaan, so that the later redactor was obliged to supply the omission from J. I venture to suggest, therefore, that we have in the addition of Canaan the first betrayal of the compiler's subjective point of view. Under the influence of the same hostile spirit toward the Canaanites which manifests itself in the old poem embodied in J, but with the extension of this hostility to a larger group—to Ham, which was substituted for Canaan—the compiler of P's list places Canaan in the group now associated with the accursed nations, but which was originally intended merely to represent the remote nations of the south, as Japheth represented remote nations of the west, north and northeast. That even a learned compiler living in Babylonia, and actuated primarily by a scholastic aim to draw up an elaborate scheme of a series of nations and peoples in illustration of his theory that all mankind can be traced back to a single ancestor, should be subject to the deeply imbedded hostility existing from the days of the Hebrew invasion of Palestine between Hebrews and Canaanites is surely not surprising. Such a limitation of the mental horizon is precisely of the kind that we would have a right to expect. Removing Canaan from the group, we would have the Hamites consistently representing the remote nations of the south, as the Japhethites represent the remote nations of the west, north and northeast.

VI.

Leaving aside for the moment the problem involved in the change of sentiment which converted the Hamites into a group synonymous with the "accursed" nations and turning to the genealogy of Shem, it is noticeable that the beginning is made with Elam, lying immediately to the east of Babylonia, and that the group is closed with Aram, which appears to be a general designation for the district lying to the west and northwest of Babylonia and Assyria. We now know that the political relations between Elam

¹As, *e.g.*, the view maintained by Dillmann (*Genesis*, p. 179) that the inclusion of Canaan among the sons of Ham rests upon the knowledge that the Canaanites came from a southern district.

and Babylonia date back to a very early period,¹ and that in fact the history of the one district is so closely entwined with the fortunes of the other that it would be quite as natural to group Elam and Babylonia together as to place Babylonia and Assyria side by side. Linguistic and ethnic differences between Elamites and Babylonians would not obtrude themselves to the mind of an ancient writer in the face of such close political associations as bound Elam and Babylonia together.

Again, a grouping which begins with Elam as the eastern outlying province of Babylonia and ending with Aram as the western limit would be intelligible from the standpoint of one living within the district of Babylonia, and this view is confirmed by the introduction of Asshur immediately after Elam. Moreover under Aram, subdivisions are recorded—Uz, Hul, Gether, Mash²—that play no part whatsoever in Hebrew history, and could have been of interest only to Babylonians and Assyrians as representing districts lying beyond the Euphrates, and with which their armies would come into contact in the course of expeditions to the west or by which they might at one time or the other have been menaced. At all events, Aram designates a miscellaneous group of peoples whose settlements form the western boundary of Babylonia and Assyria proper, and so far we would have as the point of union in the enumeration of the sons of Shem, the settlements in the immediate environment of Babylonia and Assyria—to the east and west respectively. This view is not contradicted by the mention of Arpachshad immediately after Asshur, for however we wish to account for this name, the last element *k-sh-d* is certainly in some way connected with *Kashdim*—the designation of the Chaldeans. Of the various explanations offered,³ the most plausible is to divide the word into two elements, *a-r-p* which may be identified with Arrapachitis (= *Arbakha*) and *k-sh-d* which is Chaldæa, so that we would have two distinct districts that have by an error been

¹ See De Morgan, "L'Histoire de l'Elam" (*Revue Archeol.*, 3em. Serie, Vol. 40, pp. 149-171).

² For proposed identifications of Uz, Hul and Mash see Gunkel (*Genesis*, p. 142), Holzinger (*Genesis*, p. 105) and Glaser (*Skizze, etc.*, pp. 411-422). The situation of Gether is entirely unknown.

³ See Holzinger, *Genesis*, p. 105, and Gunkel, *l.c.*, p. 143, who accept Cheyne's view of the division of the word (*Zeits. f. Alttest. Wiss.*, 1897, p. 190), into Arpach and Keshed.

merged into one. However this may be, so much is certain that Arpachshad is still to be sought within or near the district represented by Babylonia and Assyria. More puzzling than Arpachshad is the fourth subdivision Lud, and no entirely satisfactory explanation of its occurrence here has as yet been offered. Certainly Lud in P's list can have nothing but the name in common with the Lud that occurs in Isaiah 66, 19, and in Ezekiel 27, 10 and 30, 5—which is clearly Lydia in Asia Minor—and unless we assume (as I am inclined to do) that the introduction of Lud in Genesis 10, 22 is due to an error—

Arpachshad w*-Lud

being here (verse 22) superinduced by

Arpachshad ya-lad

in verse 24¹— we must provisionally accept the possibility of there having been a district Lud between the Babylonian-Assyrian district and what P understood by Aram. For the present, there are no substantial reasons for questioning on this account the thesis here maintained that in P the Shemites represent Babylonia and Assyria and the groups adjacent, in contrast to the Japhethites and Hamites who represent the remote nations in the various directions of the compass. We may, therefore, conclude that P's list, taken as a whole and leaving aside more or less obscure details which do not, however, upset the general conclusion, betrays the learned compiler whose geographical horizon has been enlarged by becoming subject to his Babylonian environment. In addition to gathering some of his geographical knowledge from Babylonian documents or through intercourse with the learned scribes of Babylonia, his general point of view in his grouping of nations has regard for interests affecting Babylonia and Assyria, as in the case of the northern and northeastern branches of the Japhethites, or is determined, as in his grouping of Shemites, by his residence in Babylonia.

The purely scholastic character of the list is interfered with only by the addition of Canaan to the Hamitic group, the introduction

¹ Wiedemann supposes (*Geschichte Aegyptens*, p. 24), that Lud is the original form of Rut which with a "denominative" ending—i.e., Ruten—occurs in Egyptian inscriptions as the designation of Syria and Palestine. See however the objections to this conjecture in Schrader's *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, i, p. 99. Nor is Jensen's proposition to read Lubdi (adopted by Jeremias, *A. T. im Lichte des alten Orients*, p. 170), at all satisfactory.

of which is due to the hostility existing between Hebrews and Canaanites.¹ Taking up now this departure on the part of the compiler of P from the scholastic principles that guided him in drawing up the list, it is clear that he could only have been led to destroy the harmony of his scheme by placing Canaan under Ham instead of, according to their proper position, next to Aram, if the view had become general that the Hamites represent the "accursed" nations.

VII.

To justify this assumption, which involves a radical change from the original conception of the Hamites as the nations of the remote south, it is necessary to find other evidence for it. Such evidence is forthcoming not merely in the narrative which substitutes Ham for Canaan, but also in J's grouping so far as his *Völkertafel* has been preserved.

We have seen that J enlarges the curse originally pronounced upon Canaan into a general denunciation of a larger group whom he calls Hamites. At the same time, he does not venture to alter the ancient tradition entirely but makes a compromise by including Canaan under Ham. Whatever the source may have been whence J derived the name of Ham, for him this youngest son of Noah has clearly come to be synonymous with those nations which are particularly obnoxious to him. Let us see whom J places in this group. We have in the first place Nimrod whom he connects with Cush as against P who does not mention Nimrod, but who places seven other nations, representing groups settled in Arabia, among the sons of Cush.² Nimrod, however, as verses 10 and 11 clearly show, is in J's list the representative of Babylonia and Assyria—nay the founder of these empires, in marked contradistinction therefore to P who, as

¹ It is only proper to note that the view which assumes Canaan's place among the Hamites to be due to feelings of natural hostility was maintained by older writers as, e.g., Sprenger (*Geographie Arabiens*, p. 294 seq.) who lays strong emphasis on the point, but since the days of Dillmann has been generally abandoned. The attempts, however, that have been made to account for the place assigned to Canaan are singularly inadequate. Recent writers either ignore the point entirely or content themselves, like Holzinger (*Genesis*, p. 96), with the suggestion that the inclusion of Canaan among Hamites is merely characteristic of the prevailing ignorance among the Hebrews in matters pertaining to ethnology.

² See above, p. 187.

we have seen, places these nations among the sons of Shem. If Nimrod is a Hamite, it follows that Babylonians and Assyrians are Hamites and the attitude towards Nimrod implied in thus placing him among the Hamites is clearly indicated by the gloss (verse 9)

“*he was a mighty hunter before Jahweh*”

where the words “before Jahweh” indicate as is now generally recognized by commentators¹ “in defiance of Jahweh,” implying an opposition of some kind to Jahweh or if that is going too far, as, at all events, carrying on a pursuit which was not pleasing in the eyes of Jahweh. Whatever the original force of the phrase “mighty hunter”—concealing perhaps some reference to an ancient myth—may have been, to the one who introduced the gloss in J’s list of nations Nimrod was a conqueror, a “hunter” of spoil, as it were, fired by the ambition to extend his dominion. As a conqueror he, therefore, appears in the following verses where the enlargement of his kingdom is referred to and the extent of Babylonia and Assyria is indicated by the mention of the chief cities of both districts. To J, therefore, the chief if not the only interest attaching to Cush lies in his being the ancestor through Nimrod of Babylonia and Assyria and whatever other nations—if any—were included by him under Cush. His motive for making Babylonia and Assyria descendants of Cush was not geographical position, nor is it at all likely that he had in mind a district by the name of Cush to the east of Babylonia whence in his opinion Babylonians and Assyrians came²—though it may be admitted that the notice rests ultimately on a confusion between two Cushs³—but he was actuated solely by the desire to place Babylonians and Assyrians among the Hamites

¹ See, e.g., Budde, *Urgeschichte*, p. 393; Holzinger, *Genesis*, p. 99. Renan, too, explained the phrase as indicating opposition to Jahweh. Compare also the phrase “a great city to God” (Jonah, 3 3), equivalent to a “godless city.”

² So e.g., Winckler, *Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen*, p. 149. Cf. Gunkel, *Genesis*, pp. 81–82.

³ For our purposes it is immaterial whether Cush in the mind of the writer who added the section about Nimrod meant the African or the Arabic Cush; and even though some faint tradition of a third “Babylonian” Cush (i.e., the Cassites) underlies the tale, it is certain that the writer has the same Cush in mind as in P (verse 7). Delitzsch’s view (*Wo Lag das Paradies*, p. 52 seq., and pp. 127–129) of a close historical connection between the “Babylonian” and “African” Cush is untenable, though he correctly places the seven subdivisions of Cush in Arabia and not in Africa. See above, p. 187.

under his general view that the latter represent the accursed nations. If we turn to Hebrew history, we will find in the relations existing between the Hebrews and the Babylonians and Assyrians the all-sufficient motive for this hostility. Babylonia which exercised a control over Syria and Palestine at a very early date as the Tel El Amarna tablets show,¹ until she was obliged to yield to Egypt and to concentrate her efforts on the endeavor to check the growing power of Assyria, must have been regarded as a natural menace to the Canaanitish settlers in Palestine even before the Hebrews entered the land. The latter therefore inherited from their predecessors a feeling of hostility towards Babylonia and not differentiating Babylonia sharply from Assyria, the bitter feeling towards both would be accentuated by the subsequent course of events.² From the ninth century on, the two Hebrew kingdoms were exposed to frequent attacks from the military expeditions undertaken by the Assyrian conquerors. The fall of the northern kingdom in 722 B.C. and the practical subjection of the southern by Sennacherib and his successors further strengthened this hostility, which found a forcible expression in the utterances of the pre-exilic prophets and is reflected in the grouping of Babylonia and Assyria with the "accursed" nations in J. It is not necessary for our purposes to assume that the form given to the feelings of resentment against Babylonia and Assyria actually presupposes the destruction of the southern kingdom, for long before this catastrophe the feelings must have been sufficiently strong to prompt a writer to regard Babylonians and Assyrians as "accursed" in the eyes of Jahweh, so that the little section inserted in J verses 8-12 may be, like J's list, of pre-exilic date; but we may well suppose the post-exilic redactor who combined J with P to have been still further incensed at the recollection of the havoc wrought by Assyria and Babylonia, the one in bringing about the downfall of the northern kingdom and the other the extinction of political life in the south, to prompt him to preserve from J—in its final form—the notice which groups

¹ See Winckler, *Keilinschriften und das alte Testament*, pp. 23-25 and 192 seq.

² See for the general relationship between Babylonia and Assyria, and the two Hebrew kingdoms, Winckler, *Keilinschriften und das alte Testament*, pp. 258-280; also for the cuneiform texts bearing on the subject Schrader's *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the O. T.*, i, 176-ii, 59, and Winckler, *Keilinschriftliches Textbuch zum alten Testament* (2d ed., Leipzig, 1903), pp. 14-55.

these two peoples among those whom Jahweh himself has cursed—much in the same spirit that leads to the retention (Genesis 19, 30–38) of the scandalous story of the origin of Moab and Ammon—two other bitter enemies of Israel—from an incestuous union of Lot with his daughters, as a bit of tribal satire, calculated to expose these peoples to the humiliation and contempt of their rivals.¹

After Nimrod, we find Egypt introduced in J. Among the Hamites we have seen that the grouping of Egypt with Cush and Put in P fits in with the latter's general view that the Hamites represent the nations of the remote south, but J for whom Cush is neither southern Arabia nor Nubia does not appear to have had such a scheme in mind, and it is in keeping with the spirit of the narrative at the close of the 9th chapter that J's motive in adding Egypt to Babylonia and Assyria among the Hamites was again the desire to illustrate the truth and the justification of the view that the sons of Ham are the "accursed" nations. It is only necessary to mention the name of Egypt in order to conjure up the picture of the hostility towards it that crops out in every section of the Old Testament. The recollection of Egyptian oppression is so strong in the Old Testament as to become almost a part of the Hebrew religion. An old nomadic sheep-offering festival combined with an agricultural spring festival, the latter adopted by the Hebrews from the Canaanites, becomes associated in the Pentateuchal codes² with the deliverance from the hated yoke of Egypt. The Decalogue begins in both versions that we possess with the description of Jahweh as the god who brought his people out of Egypt (Ex. 20, 2; Deut. 5, 6), and according to the Deuteronomistic version or recension of the Decalogue, the most characteristic institution of Judaism—the Sabbath as a day of rest

¹So according to the best of the modern commentators (see Holzinger, *Genesis*, p. 158). Somewhat different is Gunkel's view (*Genesis*, pp. 197–198), who believes that the story was originally told as an illustration of the favor and grace of the Deity in saving Lot as the ancestor of Moab and Ammon from the general destruction and in providing for this unusual method of securing offspring. Granting this, it is still evident that in the mind of the Hebrew writers, the story assumes a lowering and contemptuous aspect—to be compared with the bitter taunts and satires to be found in ancient Arabic poems when they deal with tribal hostilities. See e.g., Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien* (Halle, 1888), I, pp. 43–50.

²See Baentsch, *Com. to Exodus*, pp. 88–91; Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, pp. 445 seq.

from all labor—is instituted to serve as a reminder to the people of the conditions under which they lived in Egypt (Deut. 5, 15). If we turn to the Prophets, we find Egypt invariably associated with cruelty, deceit and oppression.¹ Pharaoh becomes a type of the persecutor and of the oppressor. Egypt is therefore placed like Babylonia and Assyria in the same category as Canaan—with the “accursed” races. It so happens, as already pointed out, that the position of Egypt accords with the geographical scheme that P adopts for the Hamitic nations; and while, in view of this, we are not justified in attributing to this compiler a motive of national hatred in placing Egypt with Cush, J, who does not appear to have had such a geographical *system* and for whom Ham is merely the larger term for Canaan which permits him to place under one category a whole series of nations who were hostile to his people, and who in his opinion are responsible for the dark pages in pre-exilic Hebrew history, is evidently actuated by such motives of national hatred in associating Egypt with Canaan; and as already intimated, the compiler who combined J with P, likewise, no longer occupies the objective and more purely scholastic standpoint of P, and takes over therefore from J the extended notices about Egypt and Canaan in order to point out in detail all those who belong to the “accursed” sons of Ham.

VIII.

This spirit of hostility crops out again in the inclusion of the Capthorites (verse 14) where the addition of the gloss “whence came the Philistines” reveals the animus of the compiler. Capthor, as Prof. W. Max Müller² has shown, is a term of indefinite character but which certainly included Cilicia and adjacent parts of the Asia Minor coast, and even a writer of so limited a range of ethnological and geographical knowledge as J, granting that he no longer knew the exact distinction of Capthor,³ could hardly have supposed the Capthorites to belong in the same category with the

¹ It is sufficient to refer to such passages as Isaiah 11, 15, and chap. 19; Ezekiel, chap. 30; Jeremiah, chap. 46; Amos 8, 9.

² *Asien und Europa*, p. 347, supplemented by the same writer's *Studien zur vorderasiatischen Geschichte*, ii (*Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, 1900), pp. 6–11.

³ That in accord with prevailing views or traditions he identified Capthor with Crete is, on the whole, more than likely.

subdivisions of Egypt, whose mention precedes that of Capthor.¹ Moreover, the position of the Capthorites at the close of verse 14 suggests (as we have seen to be the case in other instances of nations placed at the end of a series of groups), a later addition to what precedes, and the gloss indicating the origin of the Philistines in accord with the tradition recorded in Amos² and Jeremiah,³ and which is also found in Deuteronomy,⁴ unmistakably reveals the purpose of the addition. Next to the Canaanites, whom the Hebrews had to drive out before they could acquire a foothold in Palestine, the Philistines constituted the most serious obstacle to the growth of an independent Hebrew state. Prior to the days of Saul, we have three distinct periods of Philistine aggressiveness with disastrous results to the Hebrews (Judges chapter 10; Judges chapter 13; 1 Samuel chap. 4). Hostilities continued with changing fortunes through the days of Saul and David. Solomon appears to have held them in check, but after his death they regained their independence and continued to be a source of annoyance to Israel if no longer a serious menace. The Capthorites, accordingly, as identical in the mind of the one who added the gloss with the Philistines are ranked like Canaan, Babylonia, Assyria and Egypt with the "accursed" nations, who were assigned this character because of the bitter feelings of hostility of the Hebrews towards them. The "accursed" nations thus turn out to be the enemies of the people of Jahweh, whose opposition is looked upon as a defiance of Jahweh himself.

Outside of the addition of Capthorim in verse 14, the subdivisions of Egypt, enumerated in the verse in question, obscure as some of the names are, are introduced as an exhibition of learning from purely scholastic motives, which J is also willing to display where they do not interfere with his nationalistic likes and dislikes. On the other hand, it is in all probabilities a personal interest that is displayed in the enumeration of the clans constituting the subdivisions of the Canaanites. This enumeration is not set forth in the form of a genealogical chain and the proof that the list itself

¹ Verses 13-14*. Of the six subdivisions of Egypt, only two, Lehabim = Lybians, and Pathrusim = Upper Egypt, are certain, but that the other four, all probably more or less corrupt forms, represent sections or nomes of Egypt is generally admitted. For further attempts at identifications see Holzinger, *Genesis*, pp. 101-102.

² Amos 9, 7.

³ Jeremiah 47, 4.

⁴ Deut. 2, 23.

represents a later gloss, incorporated however with J and not belonging to P, is furnished by the gentile form (Jebusite, Amorite, etc.) given to the nine Canaanitish subdivisions.¹ The subdivisions themselves further emphasize and illustrate the point of view from which the Canaanites are regarded in J. Of the nine subdivisions, four (Jebusite, Amorite, Girgasite, Hivite) belong to the seven nations of Palestine, with whom marriage is forbidden in the Pentateuchal codes,² and with whom no alliance of any kind is to be made; and since it is likely that the Hamathites, referred to in Gen. 10, 18, stand for the Hittites of Deuteronomy 7, 2, we would have five of the ordinary seven subdivisions of Canaanites enumerated in this addition to J. The author of this addition, well acquainted with the various Canaanitish settlements in Palestine, introduces these five because of his special interest in that part of Palestine with which Hebrew history is especially concerned, and which was promised to them by Jahweh as their future possession (cf. Gen. 15, 18-20). In adding the Arkites, Sinites, Arvadites and Zemarites, which play a less conspicuous part in Hebrew history, he reveals his learning and scholastic interest, whereas on the other hand verse 15, which reads

“And Canaan begat Sidon his first born and Heth,”

reveals the original force attached to Canaan as embracing the Phœnicians as well as those settled in the interior. The style of this verse shows that it belongs to the original J document, though there are reasons for believing that the verse has not been preserved in its original form. If Sidon is mentioned as “the first born” we would expect other sons to have been included in the genealogy; and, again, the words “and Heth” impress one as a later addition of the same nature as the additions at the end of verse 14³ and elsewhere. The suspicion is, therefore, raised that “Heth” has been attached to Canaan from the same motive of nationalistic senti-

¹ Jebusite, Amorite, Girgasite, Hivite, Arkite, Sinite, Arvadite, Zemarite, Hamathite. The traditions in regard to the forms of these names seem to be pretty definitely established, except in the case of Sinite, for which the Greek version has *Hasennite* and the Aramaic (*Targum Onkelos*, ed. Berliner, Berlin, 1884) *Antusite*.

² See e.g., Ex. 34, 11-16; Deut. 7, 1-3. Cf. also Gen. 28, 1-8—a narrative that well reflects the bitterness of the feeling toward the Canaanites.

³ See above, pp. 179, 188, 196.

ment which relegates all enemies of Israel who hindered the advance of the latter among the "accursed" nations. It is needless for our purposes to enter upon the vexed question whether the B'ne Heth, settled in southern Palestine, are to be identified with the Hittites in the northeast, where Hamath formed one of the centres of their settlements.¹ The Hebrew writers, as is quite evident, considered them identical, and although those in the south enter into friendly relations with the early Hebrew invaders, as illustrated by the traditions regarding Abraham's dealings with the B'ne Heth,² those in the north are included among the enemies with whom no alliances of any kind are to be made. The term "Heth" may indeed have been introduced by the one who added it to Sidon to include the entire interior of Palestine, which a later glossator not satisfied with so vague an expression amplified by the specification of the nine subdivisions in verse 16-18.³ However this may be, the addition of Heth and the further specification of nine subdivisions, whether originally intended as specifications of Hittites or of Canaanites, are prompted and retained by the desire to make it perfectly clear that the groups with which the Hebrews were to make no entangling alliances of any kind, whether social or political, belong to the "accursed" Hamites.

This same motive is further illustrated in the indication of the boundaries of the Canaanitish settlements. Taking in the Phœnician coast to Gerar, or according to the variant to Gaza,⁴ he carries the eastern boundary to Sodom and Gomorrah. I venture to suggest that this specification is not prompted by purely scholastic interests, but from a desire to leave no doubt, on the one hand, as to the inclusion of the hated Philistines, represented by Gerar and Gaza, among the Hamites, and, on the other, to point out by the

¹ That the term "Hittites" was used to embrace large groups of peoples that entered Syria and Palestine from the mountain districts of the north and north-west is now generally recognized. The vagueness of the nomenclature complicates the historical and ethnological problems, but it may be said that what evidence is available does not militate against regarding the northern and southern Hittites of Palestine and Syria as belonging to the same general group.

² Genesis, chap. 23.

³ See above, p. 197.

⁴ Verse 19. It matters little whether we take Gerar or Gaza as the gloss, though the former, about six miles farther south of Gaza, being less well known, probably represents the original reading, to which a glossator added as a memorandum "Gaza," as a better known boundary of Philistine settlements.

introduction of Sodom and Gomorrah that the inhabitants of this district as well as two other peoples particularly obnoxious to the Hebrews, namely, Moab and Ammon, whose origin, according to the libellous tradition recorded in Genesis 19, 30-38, is distinctly connected with Sodom and Gomorrah, also belong to the "accursed" nations. This tale follows immediately upon the story of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, evidently with the intention of associating Moabites and Ammonites,—whose hostile relations to the Hebrews are illustrated in many a page of the Old Testament,—with wickedness and shameful immorality. However this may be, Sodom and Gomorrah are for J, as for the Hebrew prophets, the type of all that is "accursed,"¹ and for this reason those who dwelt in this region are singled out as belonging with peculiar appropriateness to the sons of Ham.

Naturally, there are innumerable details in the early history of the Hebrews, as also in the later periods, which escape us so that it is no longer possible to determine the full extent to which this motive of national dislike influenced the school of writers, the result of whose work is to be seen in J's list as modified by later additions, insertions and glosses, but enough has been shown to justify the proposition that in contradistinction to P, who betrays not only a much broader geographical and ethnographic knowledge but also greater objectivity, J and the school that he represents are largely, if not completely, under the spell of the character given to Ham at the close of the 9th chapter of Genesis. For J, Ham is not an ethnic unit nor a designation for a group of peoples settled in a certain section of the known world, but a kind of ethnological purgatory to which all those nations are assigned,—Babylonians, Assyrians, Egyptians, Canaanites, Philistines, Sodomites, Gomorrites,—who have merited this fate in the mind of the writer by their hostility to Jahweh's people, and as the cause of the misfortunes, hardships, struggles and catastrophes in the career of the Hebrews. On a supposition of this kind we can account for the jumble of such heterogeneous groups as Canaanites in Palestine, Egyptians in the South, Babylonians and Assyrians in the East, and Philistines in the West into one category, unless, indeed, we are prepared to commit exegetical suicide by assuming that no principle whatso-

¹ Cf., *e.g.*, Isaiah 1, 10; 3, 9; 13, 19. Jer. 23, 14. Amos, 4, 11, and Zeph. 2, 9, where Moab and Ammon are compared to Sodom and Gomorrah.

ever presided over the grouping. The view here advanced of the different conceptions regarding Ham by the J-group of writers from that which is found in P also accounts in a rational and, I believe, in a satisfactory way for the manifest contradictions between J and P as, *e.g.*, the grouping of Asshur with Cush by the former and with Shem by the latter.

IX.

In conclusion, a few words about the genealogy of Shem in J and P, which will further illustrate the thesis here maintained. If Ham in the mind of the nationalistic J is the type of the "accursed" son, Shem appears with equal distinctness as the favored one. This view is clearly brought out in the blessing over Shem (Gen. 9, 25-27). The double mention of Shem already shows this, and whether we read with Grätz and Gunkel,¹

"Bless, O Jahweh, the tents of Shem,"

or with Budde and Holzinger,

"Blessed of Jahweh is Shem,"

there can be no doubt of the preference shown for Shem by the J group of writers to whom this blessing belongs. The source and original force associated with Shem² is as obscure as that of Ham. Back of both names no doubt lies a mass of traditions and possibly also myths which have been lost, but when once in some way the favorable conception in regard to Shem had become current it would be natural for J to make the endeavor to trace the origin of his own people to this favorite son. Such is the purpose of the rather

¹ See above, p. 181 *seq.*

² Shem signifying "fame," "distinction," has been compared with Aryan "ruler," "noble," as a designation of the favorite group (see Holzinger, *Genesis*, p. 92), but all such explanations are open to the objection that they assume the introduction of the name to be due to the Hebrew writers, whereas it is evident that both Shem and Ham (which on the same supposition has been explained as "hot," *i.e.*, 'the southerners' of Holzinger, *l. c.*) are terms adopted by Hebrew writers and belong presumably to a much earlier age than their use in the *Völkertafel*. There is much to be said in favor of the view which regards both names as designations of old deities, though this view, likewise, is open to objections which cannot easily be set aside. See Hommel, *Altisraelitische Ueberlieferung*, pp. 47 and 115.

awkwardly constructed 21st verse of the 10th chapter.¹ The curious phrase defining Shem as "the father of all the sons of Eber" reveals the existence of an earlier tradition, which traced the Hebrews back to Eber. In view of this, one is tempted to conjecture that in an older form of the blessing at the end of the 9th chapter, Eber took the place now occupied by Shem, so that the original personages concerned in the blessing and curse were Eber, Canaan and Japheth, subsequently enlarged to Shem, Ham and Japheth. However this may be, it is interesting and of some importance to observe that when Eber was first associated with Shem, the former was made the son of the latter, whereas in the more scholastic ethnological scheme devised by P, the relationship of Eber to Shem was altered into that of greatgrandfather and greatgrandson.² How far this view already prevailed in pre-exilic days among some groups of writers it is, of course, impossible to say. Of the four sons of Shem in P, Elam, Asshur, Arpachshad and Aram, it would appear that Elam is used as an inclusive term to embrace Babylonia. If this be correct we might have in this use of Elam an indication of the date of P's *Völkertafel*, inasmuch as such a usage would point to the absorption of Babylonia by a power advancing from Elam. This power would, of course, be none other than Persia, and the use of Elam here as including Babylonia would thus force us to the conclusion that P's list belongs to the close of the exilic period, subsequent to Cyrus' conquest of Babylonia in 539 B.C. The theory, it must be admitted, encounters an obstacle in Arpachshad, if, as seems plausible, the latter embodies a reference to Chaldæa, since it would involve the further supposition of a differentiation on the part of Hebrew writers between Chaldæa and Babylonia. One can understand and indeed recognize the necessity of such a differentiation from the standpoint of one who, while placing Baby-

¹ It reads literally "and to Shem, there was born even he the father of all the sons of Eber, the brother of Japheth the elder." Then follows "the sons of Shem are Elam, Asshur, etc." Comparing the beginning of verse 21 with the beginning of verse 25, "and to Eber were born two sons, etc.," we should expect the enumeration of the sons of Shem immediately after the words "and to Shem there was born."

² Shem, Arpachshad, Shelah, Eber (verse 24).

³ Omitting Lud, which is a hopeless stumbling block (cf. Holzinger, *Genesis*, p. 105), and which as has above been suggested (p. 190) may have slipped in here through confusion with *yabad* in verse 24.

lonia and Assyria with the genealogy of Ham through Nimrod, the grandson of Ham, yet shares the common tradition which traces Eber the ancestor of the Hebrews (or Terah the descendant of Eber) to Ur-Kasdim, *i.e.*, to Chaldæa. Hence J, despite his hostility to Assyria and Babylonia, admits Arpachshad, which certainly stands in some relationship to Ur-Kasdim, among the Shemites. Since P, however, places Asshur or Assyria with the sons of Shem, he does not share J's view of Assyria or Babylonia, and there would be no reason why he should either omit Babylonia or specifically differentiate Chaldæa from Babylonia, unless it be, indeed, that he includes Arpachshad in obedience to the tradition which associated the latter with the home of his people. On the whole, this appears to be the more plausible view, for while P, as we have seen, manifests his purely scholastic interests to an astonishing degree, he yet is not entirely free from the natural spirit of national likes and dislikes, and at all events would be inclined to embody in his list current traditions regarding the origin of his people, even where such an embodiment might be superfluous or render his scheme somewhat ambiguous. Assuming then that Elam includes Babylonia, and that Arpachshad is Chaldæa, the Shemites, according to P, would represent the groups living in the district to which the Hebrews traced their origin, Elam, Babylonia, Assyria and Chaldæa, and the groups immediately to the west and northwest, classed by P under the general designation of Aram. We have no means of determining whether J's list also included Aram among the sons of Shem, but there is also no positive evidence against it. If it did, the genealogy of Aram was probably identical with the one preserved in P, or at all events did not contain sufficiently important derivations to warrant the compiler who combined J with P in extracting anything from J's list. So much seems certain, that J's chief interest lay in Arpachshad, because of the supposed connection between this district and Ur-Kasdim or Chaldæa as the home of the Hebrews, and J's interest here was sufficiently pronounced to induce him to carry down the line of Arpachshad in its two branches, Eber-Peleg and Eber-Joktan, the former representing a northern group, the latter a southern, much as the Arabs carry the genealogies of their clans to a northern and southern ancestor.¹

¹ See Wüstenfeld's *Genealogische Tabellen der Arabischen Stämme und Familien* (Göttingen, 1852).

Of J's double list, only the Eber-Joktan, the southern branch, has been preserved in the 10th chapter,¹ the northern branch being omitted by the compiler of J and P, because of its preservation in the P document in the 11th chapter, verses 16-26. The groups thus included in J's genealogy of Shemites would be limited to those descended from Arpachshad and Aram, or since Arpachshad represents on the one hand the Hebrews as the descendants of the northern branch of Eber-Peleg, and the Arabs on the other hand as the descendants of the southern branch of Eber-Joktan, the Shemites would be limited to groups in the immediate environment of the Hebrews. The point of view is apparently that of the Hebrew settlements to the east of the Jordan, Eber-Joktan representing the southern groups and Aram the northern and northwestern, with Eber-Peleg occupying the central position. Here too, therefore, we find J presenting a contrast to P, who, standing for an enlarged geographical and ethnological view, begins his enumeration with Elam to the East and passes on in a westerly and then northwesterly direction, which leads him to include Chaldæa, Babylonia and Assyria and to end with Aram. The point of view here suggests Babylonia or Chaldæa as the home of P, or at all events as the central seat of the Shemites, with Elam constituting the eastern and Aram the western limit and environment. Consistent, moreover, with his view of the Hamites as the designation of groups settled in the remote south, he excludes those peoples included by J in the Eber-Joktan branch of Arpachshad from the Shemites, and as the Eber-Peleg list of P in the 11th chapter shows, P limits the Shemite branch of Arpachshad to the Eber-Peleg or northern division.

The general scheme in P's *Völkertafel* is thus quite clearly based on a geographical distribution into three zones, Japheth representing the remote groups to the west, north and northeast, the Hamites representing the remote nations in the south, while the Shemites represent those in the immediate environment of the Hebrews from the point of view of a writer who, living in Babylonia, is influenced both by conditions prevailing in his days, by the tradition which traced the Hebrews to Chaldæa, as well as by the fact of the later settlements of the Hebrews to the east of the Jordan and in Palestine proper. Taking all these factors together, to which we ought perhaps to add the inclusion of Babylonia under Elam as due to

¹ Verses 26-29.

special circumstances, the Shemites are for P the groups that live in districts in which, at one time or the other, the Hebrews had settled, or which represent districts adjacent to those settlements. The Shemites are, therefore, the groups that are "near" to the Hebrews as against the Japhethites and Hamites who are "remote." Again, while as we have seen P is actuated by large geographical views and displays considerable ethnological knowledge set forth in a scholastic spirit, it is natural that when he comes to the group to which his own people belongs he should show some traces also of a nationalistic spirit. His general point of view in regard to the Shemites as representing those nations which are adjacent to the Hebrews, or "near" them, may be put down to the credit of his nationalistic spirit, while the departure from his scheme in including Canaan among the Hamites instead of placing them with the "near" nations or Shemites may represent a trace of the influence of the spirit of hostility towards Canaanites which controls J, though it is also possible that the addition of Canaan in verse 6 is due to the compiler who combined J with P, and who is actuated by the same spirit as is J.

X.

In sharp contrast, both as to geographical views and ethnographical knowledge and general spirit, stands J and the group of writers to which he belongs or who follow in his path. Showing distinct traces of the older view which limits the geographical horizon to three groups, Shem (or perhaps Eber¹), Canaan and Japheth, all dwelling within the confines of Hebrew settlements in Palestine, J, though representing an enlarged view in substituting Ham for Canaan (and Shem for Eber), and in extending Japheth to include remote nations with which Hebrew history has nothing to do, arranges his *Völkertafel* entirely from the Hebrew point of view. Though apparently agreeing with P in his definition of Japhethites it is doubtful whether J's list of sons and descendants of Japheth was as extensive as P's, and at all events the Japhethites did not represent the geographically remote nations but rather those that were historically remote, toward which a writer interested primarily

¹In view of the importance which Eber plays as the ancestor of the two groups, Eber-Peleg and Eber-Joktan, it would indeed appear as already suggested (p. 201) that a tradition was current which made him rather than Shem the ancestor of the groups allied with the Hebrews.

and, indeed, exclusively in Hebrew history would be wholly indifferent. The Japhethites are, accordingly, no longer "a group dwelling in the tents of Shem," but quite outside of these tents. More marked is the contrast between J and P in regard to the Hamites. While here, too, it happens that from P's point of view Egypt falls into the category of the Hamites, still the whole character of Ham's genealogy in P shows that this is done because of the agreement with P's definition of Hamites as embracing the "remote" nations of the south. In the mind of J, however, the Hamites take the place of Canaan, the "accursed" son of Noah, and the enlargement of Canaan to Ham furnishes him with the opportunity of adding to Canaan a whole series of nations who, because of the mischief they wrought at one time or the other in Hebrew history, merit the fate of being cast into the purgatory of the "accursed" nations. From this point of view, J includes Egypt among the Hamites and adds to Canaan and Egypt, the Babylonians and Assyrians, as well as the Philistines, while subsequent writers, actuated by the same spirit as J, are at pains to specify the subdivisions of the Canaanites, and with a view of leaving no possible loophole for such types of "wickedness" as Sodom and Gomorrah, even indicate the exact boundaries of the Canaanitish settlements. The mention of Sodom and Gomorrah, even if the view above set forth that the names are intended to include Moab and Ammon be not accepted, shows too clearly to admit of any doubt the picture in J's mind of the character and nature of the Hamites.

Coming to Shem, there is a closer approach to be observed between the views of J and P and yet even here there are some striking contrasts. Not only is P's list of Shemites on the whole more inclusive, since he makes them extend from Elam in the East to Aram and Palestine in the West, though on the other hand he excludes the southern Arabs who in J represent the southern branch of Eber-Joktan, but his historical standpoint is also larger than that of J, since he embodies in his list not only the tradition of the original home of the Hebrews but draws the proper conclusion from this tradition that the inclusion of Arpachshad or Chaldæa among the sons of Shem carries with it Babylonia (including Elam) and Assyria. J in all probabilities included Aram by the side of Arpachshad among the sons of Shem, but his point of view is that of one who is exclusively interested in Hebrew history. The im-

portance of Shem lies for him in the fact that Shem is "the father of all the children of Eber." For him the "remote" nations of the south, with whom Hebrew history is as little concerned—barring the relationship between Judæa and southern Arabia reflected in the legends of King Solomon's dealings with the Queen of Sheba¹—as the "remote" nations of the north and east represented by the Japhethites, are not as in P the Hamites, but the groups which represent the subdivisions of southern Arabia. J, therefore, like P has two "remote" groups, but the entire character of the former's *Völkertafel* is changed by his definition of the Hamites as those representing the enemies of Israel.

To sum up, therefore, J's list includes three general groups: (a) peoples towards whom J was indifferent because of little or of no moment to Hebrew history, (b) peoples towards whom he harbored bitter feelings of hostility, and (c) his own people towards whom he was partial and whose descent he traced from the favorite son of Noah. The first group includes again (1) the Japhethites in the west, north and northeast and (2) the Eber-Joktan branch or southern Arabs. His nationalistic spirit manifests itself in those whom he places in the second group, while on the other hand the limits to this spirit are represented by his willingness to place the southern Arabs among the favored Shemites, being prompted to this display of generosity by the absence of any motive for excluding them and the self-evident consideration that the Shemites must include other subdivisions besides his favorites—the Hebrews. The scholastic spirit which J also possesses when it does not interfere with his natural dislikes, though not to the same degree as P, leads him likewise to recognize the close relationship between Hebrews and Aramæans, so that his Shemites as seems likely also included Aram.

P, on the other hand, free from the nationalistic spirit, except possibly when the Canaanites are involved, sets up two very well-defined groups: (a) the remote nations of the west, north and northeast—the Japhethites, and (b) the remote nations of the south—Nubia, Egypt and southern Arabia—the Hamites, to which he adds (c) as a third group the Hebrews and those adjacent or "near" to them, though his definition of "near" again displays a larger historical

¹ I Kings, chap. x—amplified by further details in the "Midrashic" literature. See e. g. Weil's *Biblische Legenden der Muselmänner*, pp. 247-271.